Application No.: 10/692,694 Attorney Docket No. 0465-1068P Reply to December 14, 2005 Office Action Art Unit 2862

Page 7

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the very thorough consideration given

the present application.

Claims 1-6 and 8-17 are now present in this application. Claims 1, 14,

16 and 17 are independent. Claims 1, 2, and 8 have been amended, claim 7

has been canceled, and claims 14-17 are added.

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully

requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and §103

Claims 1, 2, 5, 10 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being

anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,339,328 to Keene et al. ("Keene"). Claims 1 and 10

stand rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as anticipated by the article written by

Brake et al. ("Brake"). Claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as

unpatentable over Keene in view of U.S. Patent 5,343,707 to Sata.

rejections are respectfully traversed.

Complete discussions of the Examiner's rejections are set forth in the

Office Action, and are not being repeated here.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite the subject matter of allowable claim

7, thereby placing claim 1 into condition for allowance, along with the claims

dependent therefrom.

Application No.: 10/692,694 Attorney Docket No. 0465-1068P

Art Unit 2862 Reply to December 14, 2005 Office Action

Page 8

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1, as amended,

patentably defines over the applied art, along with dependent claims 2, 5, and

10-12.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1, 2, 5, and 10-

12 are respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the indication that claims 3, 4,

6-9 and 13 contain allowable subject matter. Applicants have re-written claims

3, 6 and 13 in independent form as new claims 14, 16 and 17. Claim 15

depends from allowable claim 14 and is, accordingly, allowable.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed,

accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that

the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be

withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the

outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition

for allowance.

Application No.: 10/692,694

Art Unit 2862

Attorney Docket No. 0465-1068P Reply to December 14, 2005 Office Action

Page 9

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone Robert J. Webster, Registration No. 46,472, at (703) 205-8076, in the Washington, D.C. area.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By;//

sther H. Chong

Registration No. 40953

EHC/RJW:mm/vd

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

Telephone: (703)205-8000